



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,573	02/08/2001	Samuel Sergio Tenembaum		4194

7590 06/04/2004

SAMUEL SERGIO TENEMBAUM
c/o 34 EAST 67th STREET
New York, NY 10021

EXAMINER

JASMIN, LYNDIA C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/778,573

Applicant(s)

TENEMBAUM, SAMUEL SERGIO

Examiner

Lynda Jasmin

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

1. Amendment received on January 30, 2004 has been acknowledged.
2. The substitute specification and drawings correction filed January 30, 2004 have been entered.

Claim Objections

3. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Thus, claims 6 and 8 seem to be incomplete or a --,-- should follow after the term "Dutch" and "split".

In claim 5, the term "a" after "least" should be deleted.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the recitation "the buyer's credit" lacks proper antecedent basis. Also in claim 1 the recitation "the interest rate offered to the borrower" lacks proper antecedent basis.

In claim 4, at line 3 the term "or" should not be deleted.

Art Unit: 3627

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-5, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Talbot et al. (2002/0116312 A1).

As best understood, Talbot et al. discloses a method of creating an online marketing environment (OLME) comprising the steps of providing a community of reverse credit auctions (via a reverse blind electronic credit auction) including borrowers and lenders connected to a computer network (via network 110) through their respective computing devices (via 102, 104, 106) in which each auction includes borrowers who presents a buyer's credit needs and collaterals and a subgroup of the lenders which may include all of the lenders, who analyze the auctions on a caveat emptor basis and compete to provide credit to the borrower in an auction by adjusting the interest rates offered to the borrower (as illustrated in the background of the invention, having an online loan marketplace where *lenders* bid for borrower's business and allow *borrowers* to choose among multiple loan offers including terms and *rates*).

Talbot et al. further discloses at least one of the lenders is one of an individual investors and a professional and non-professional investor (see page 4; box 0047). The

Art Unit: 3627

at least one borrowers includes one of an entity having current access to the traditional asset based financial market (via borrowers bidding for financial institution's products). At least one or more support player connected to the network through a respective computing device (via client devices), the support player being an entity from the group consisting of: credit rating companies and personal credit rating companies (via credit report 302 is obtained from one, or more, of many credit reporting services).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 6-11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Talbot et al. in view of Kocher (2003/0061150 A1).

As best understood, Talbot et al. discloses the elements of the claimed invention, but fails to explicitly the different type of auctions.

Kocher discloses the concept of having performing electronic transaction including Dutch (split) or English (bulk or split) auction (similar to e-Bay [109]), where borrowers further pertain to secondary market (via 20). The revenue sources are through pawn lending rates. Kocher further discloses that the loans are designed for credit card financing (via a collateralized credit card). Thus, one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 3627

art at the time the invention was made to have provided the online market of Talbot et al. to include the Dutch and English auction taught by Kocher in order to achieve a winning bid.

10. Claim 12, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Talbot et al. in view of Kaplan et al. (2002/0095369 A1).

As best understood, Talbot et al. discloses the elements of the claimed invention, but fails to categorize the loans.

Kaplan et al. discloses the concept of having an electronic marketplace where bonds are submitted for an auction or PriceMatch.

From this teaching of Kaplan et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the electronic credit auction of Talbot et al. to include the categorized auction system taught by Kaplan et al. for the purpose of utilizing a recognized, independent and reputable transaction clearing entity to guarantee all trades executed on the system.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Parthasarathy and Hillestad et al. for disclosing electronic lending


Art Unit: 3627

and borrowing system and where lenders are charged a transaction fee which are shared by other lenders who extend credit offers to buyer of credit.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lynda Jasmin whose telephone number is (703) 305-0465. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday (8:00-5:30) alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert P Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Lynda Jasmin
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3627
6/1/04

lj